

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One New Sheet of Drawings containing Figure 35 is attached hereto. The New Sheet of Drawings contains new Figure 35, which depicts an extension cable incorporating an electrical power supply distribution apparatus. No new matter has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided. Applicant also acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 5 and 11 contain allowable subject matter on Page 8 of the Official Action.

As indicated during the personal interview of September 12, 2006 with Examiner CHANDRIKA PRASAD, Applicant submits that the instant amendment is proper for entry after final rejection. Applicant notes that no question of new matter nor are any new issues raised in entering the instant amendment and that no new search would be required.

Moreover, Applicant submits that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, or at least in better form for appeal.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner enter the instant amendment, consider the merits of the same, and indicate the allowability of the present application and each of the pending claims.

Upon entry of the present amendment, the Drawings and Specification will have been amended. Claims 1-46 and 51-90 and 97 are currently pending; with claims 14,16, 17, 19-46, 51-81 and 88-90 being withdrawn from consideration in a previous Official Action. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding objection and rejections, and allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for purportedly not showing an extension cable.

In regard to the amendments to the Drawings, Applicant notes that newly added Figure 35 includes an extension cable that incorporates an electrical power supply distribution apparatus of a non-limiting embodiment of the present disclosure. Applicant submits that these amendments do not include any impermissible new matter. In particular, Applicant notes that support for such a extension cable can be found, inter alia, in at least original claim 96, and on page 6, lines 15 and 16, and on page 41 line 6 of the Specification.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to the Drawings and Specification (which has been amended, where appropriate, to reference the new sheet of Drawings), and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 82 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement.

As discussed *supra*, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. In particular, Applicant's Attorney pointed out, and the Examiner agreed, that at least page 12, line 21, through page 13, line 11, provides adequate support for the amendments made in the previous Response. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7, 12-13 and 82-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by ROGERS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,688,132); and

Claims 1, 3-10, 47 and 49-50 as being anticipated by HUMPHREYS (U.S. Patent No. 4,243, 284). Initially, Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that

claims 47, 49 and 50 were canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein) in the Response filed on May 1, 2006. Accordingly the rejection thereof is believed to be moot.

In regard to the rejection of claims 1-13, 15, 18, 82-87 and 97, as discussed *supra*, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Applicant submits that ROGERS and HUMPHREYS, as well as the other references of record, are markedly different from the present claimed invention. Specifically, as discussed *supra*, ROGERS and HUMPHREYS fail to teach or suggest the conductive member being resiliently displaceable by the connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of the connector to the at least one conductor and a second position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor, as generally recited in claims 1 and 82. Rather, in ROGERS the grounding conductor (G) is received in a central slot (as shown in FIG. 2), and is deflected by the plug stud when the plug is inserted into the opening. In regard to HUMPHREYS, HUMPHREYS discloses the contact and earth pins (which the junior Examiner previously characterized as an elongated) as being part of the plug body (70) and NOT the conduit 29 (see Col. 7, lines 32-44 and FIG. 4). Thus, neither ROGERS nor HUMPHREYS disclose the above-noted combination of elements.

Absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claims 1 and 82 as well as claims 2-13, 15, 18, 83-87 and 97, respectively dependent therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Further, all pending dependent

claims recite additional features that further define the present invention over the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allow all pending claims in the present application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ROGERS in view of NADEAU (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,328); and

Claim 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over HUMPHREYS (although the Examiner has mistakenly referenced U.S. Patent No. 4,243,284 to HUMPHREYS, as TAN as discussed above) as an obvious matter of duplication of essential working parts. Initially, Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that claim 48 was canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein) in the Response filed on May 1, 2006. Accordingly, the rejection thereof is believed to be moot.

In regard to the rejection of claims 15 and 18, Applicant submits that dependent claims 15 and 18 are at least patentable due to their respective dependencies from claim 1 for the reasons noted above. In this regard, Applicant notes that the Examiner has provided no explanation or motivation for correcting the above-noted deficiencies in the teachings of ROGERS and HUMPHREYS. Applicant further submits that NADEAU does not provide any teachings which could reasonably be characterized as curing the above-noted deficiencies in the teachings of ROGERS and HUMPHREYS. In this regard, Applicant submits that NADEAU does not disclose the conductive member being resiliently displaceable by the connector between a first position in which the member prevents access of the connector to the at least one conductor and a second

position in which the member allows said connector to be electrically connected to the at least one conductor.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 15 and 18, since both claims are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed *supra*, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least these reasons. Further, both dependent claims 15 and 18 recite additional features which further define the present invention over the references of record. It is thus respectfully submitted that all rejected claims are patentably distinct from the references of record. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In view of the remarks/arguments herein, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 82 are in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 2-13, 15, 18, 82-87 and 97, Applicant asserts that they are allowable on their own merit, as well as because they depend from independent claims 1 and 82, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13, 15, 18, 82-87, and 97, in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in any proper combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.

P25922.A07

In view of the allowability of independent claims 1 and 82 as noted above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin withdrawn claims 14, 16, 17 and 88, which depend from one of these two independent claims, and indicate the allowability of at least these claims, as well as any other of the withdrawn claims which may be deemed allowable by the Examiner.

SUMMARY

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an indication to that effect. Applicant has argued the allowability of the claims and pointed out deficiencies of the applied reference. Accordingly, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all the claims therein are respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

William S. Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

Respectfully submitted,
Choon JONG



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

October 11, 2006
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1941 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Attachment(s): 1 sheet of Drawings

{P25922 00064570.DOC}